



**McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS P.C.**

RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA)

WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY & NJ)

MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)

JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA)

MAIN OFFICE

**33 AIRPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 202**

NEW WINDSOR, NEW YORK 12553

(845) 567-3100

FAX: (845) 567-3232

E-MAIL: MHENY@MHEPC.COM

WRITERS EMAIL: MJE@MHEPC.COM



**TOWN OF NEW WINDSOR
PLANNING BOARD
REVIEW COMMENTS**

PROJECT NAME: LOU'S AUTO DRIVING SCHOOL (MERCADO) SITE PLAN
PROJECT LOCATION: 297 WINDSOR HIGHWAY (NYS ROUTE 32)
SECTION 42 – BLOCK 1 – LOT 15
PROJECT NUMBER: 08-10
DATE: 25 FEBRUARY 2009
DESCRIPTION: THE PROJECT PROPOSES THE CONVERSION OF THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURE INTO OFFICES OCCUPANCIES (PERSONAL SERVICE AND RENTAL OFFICE). THE PLAN WAS PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED AT THE 9 JULY 2008 AND 15 OCTOBER 2009 PLANNING BOARD MEETINGS.

1. The site plan now submitted is a substantial revision, with decreased additions proposed (to the existing building), and the rear parking reoriented. The garage in the rear is relocated and grades have been revised. As such, a full new review is needed, as this plan does not merely respond to prior comments.

We have reviewed this plan set and have numerous concerns, as follows:

a) Sheet 1 – Zoning

- Provided bulk information appears correct.
- As previously noted, the total side yard (existing) value should be corrected.
- The plan includes the two spaces in the garage as part of the required ten parking spaces. The Board will need to approve this.

b) Sheet 1 - General

- The plan provides contours which we understand to be existing grades. Point elevations are proposed, which we understand to be proposed grades. Insufficient information is provided for existing grades, especially along borders with the adjoining properties and to the area along the State right-of-way. Insufficient point elevations are provided to define grades in all areas.

REGIONAL OFFICES

• 111 WHEATFIELD DRIVE • SUITE 1 • MILFORD, PENNSYLVANIA 18337 • 570-296-2765 •
• 540 BROADWAY • MONTICELLO, NEW YORK 12701 • 845-794-3399 •

- Based on the information provided, there appears to be fill proposed up to or exceeding 12 feet. No information is provided as to the type of material nor its placement. This is a critical deficiency.
- The elevation data along the east wall would appear to provide exposed face of wall varying from 6" (standard for curb) down to 2" -3" which would appear unacceptable.
- The westernmost parking space in the front of the site appears to be less than 9 ft. width, and backout from this space difficult.
- The front sidewalk is noted as 6' width but scales 7'.
- The plan should clearly indicate (point to) the proposed additions (clarify if one proposed in front, two in rear).
- The north side of the property has areas noted as "curbing" (adjacent to 6 ft. fill). This appears to be incorrect.
- The rear parking area requires 25 ft. backout, with only 23 ft. provided.
- There appears to be a conflict between parking lot grade and the indicated slab elevation of the garage.
- A rear area is noted as "Concrete Block Waste Disposal Storage". Does this mean dumpster enclosure area? A detail should be provided.

c) *Sheet 1 – Handicapped Parking Detail*

- As previously noted, the striping should be 4" width, not 2".
- As previously noted, the handicapped signs should be noted as behind sidewalk (and shown as such on the site plan).

d) *Sheet 1 – Section A (wall on west side)*

- This detail notes a 5 ft landscape strip; however, the plan shows only a 4 ft strip.
- A design will be needed for this wall, and such design will need to address the loading conditions on the adjoining property.

e) *Sheet 1 – Concrete Curb Detail*

- As previously noted, the dimensions on this detail cause a curb "reveal" of 10 inches. Explain.
- Concrete material (compressive strength) should be indicated.

f) Sheet 2 – Lighting and Landscaping

- Insufficient manufacturer data is provided to support indicated lighting data on plan. As previously requested, either manufacturer prepared lighting grid plan or a plan with individual isolux curves should be provided. Plan submitted unacceptable.
- The landscaping layout shown on the plan appears to provide scattered plantings rather than a unified landscape plan. The Board should further review and provide input.

g) Sheet 3 – Soil Erosion Plan –

- The limit of disturbance appears to only encompass the proposed retaining walls. This does not accurately reflect the proposed alterations to the site. The limit of disturbance must outline all the proposed disturbances to the existing surface conditions of the site.
- Provide a detail for the Erosion Control Mat.
- The detail for the silt fence includes a plan showing the silt fence overlapping. This aspect of the detail is incorrect. Please refer the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control, August 2005, for the correct overlapping specifications.
- Details for silt fence and hay bales are included on Sheet 3 of 3, but the location of their use could not be found. Please locate the all proposed practices.
- Provide a detail for the filter fabric drop inlet protection. Please note that under grate fabric inserts at catch basin are not an allowed practice.
- Provide notes for construction sequencing and maintenance. The notes provided on Sheet 3 of 3 must be expanded to include material specifications, timing aspects, application rates, and maintenance aspects per the above stated Standards and Specification.
- The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan included in the plan set does not adequately address the site specific concerns. The plan proposes using minimal measures to address erosion and sediment control. A more comprehensive plan will be required.
- When the above comments have been addressed, a more complete review of the SWPPP will be undertaken.

2. A public hearing was held on this application at the 15 October 2008 meeting. Once an acceptable and complete plan is available, the Board will need to evaluate the extent of the change in the site plan vs. the prior public hearing plan, to determine if another public hearing is required. As well, a determination will need to be made regarding the need for a new referral to the Orange County Dept. of Planning.
3. A referral will be needed to the NYS DOT. At this time, I believe the plan is not adequately complete for such referral.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Edsall', written over a horizontal line.

Mark J. Edsall, P.E., P.P.
Engineer for the Planning Board

MJE/st
NW08-10-25Feb09.doc